

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated August 3, 2010, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claim 1 is hereby amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 2-8 and 15 have previously been canceled. Claim 17 is canceled herein without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Claims 9-14 have previously been withdrawn. Claims 1, 9-14, 16 and 18-26 are currently pending with claims 9-14 and 22-26 withdrawn. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

**Election/ Restriction Requirement**

Applicants hereby provisionally elect group I, claims 1 and 16-21. Claims 22-26 have been withdrawn herein.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101**

**Claims 1 and 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.** *Office Action* at p. 3. Claim 17 has been canceled herein, rendering rejection of this claim moot. As to the remaining claims, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 1 has been amended herein to recite a laundry dryer control method comprising:

- initiating a drying procedure by driving a heater for heating air and a motor for rotating a drum;
- measuring temperature by a temperature sensor;
- calculating a plurality of temperature variation rates;
- detecting whether there is a substantial increase in the temperature variation rate with respect to the temperature variation rate of initiating the drying procedure;
- calculating a remaining drying time after the substantial increased is detected; and
- performing the drying procedure for the calculated remaining drying time, wherein the drying procedure is divided by the difference of the temperature variation rate as the drying procedure proceeds.

Accordingly, the claimed method is implemented by particular machines (e.g. a heater, a motor, and a temperature sensor) and is eligible subject matter. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §101 of claims 1 and 16-21.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

**Claims 1 and 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,412,389 to Krüger (hereinafter “Krüger”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,682,684 to Wentzlaff (hereinafter “Wentzlaff”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,257,170 to Gestblom et al. (hereinafter “Gestblom”).** *Office Action* at p. 3. Claim 17 has been canceled herein, rendering rejection of this claim moot. As to the remaining claims, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recite a combination of steps including, for example, “initiating a drying procedure by driving a heater for heating air and a motor for rotating a drum; measuring temperature by a temperature sensor; calculating a plurality of temperature variation rates; detecting whether there is a substantial increase in the temperature variation rate with respect to the temperature variation rate of initiating the drying procedure; calculating a remaining drying time after the substantial increased is detected; and performing the drying procedure for the calculated remaining drying time, wherein the drying procedure is divided by the difference of the temperature variation rate as the drying procedure proceeds.” None of the cited references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest each and every claimed step.

The Office alleges that Kruger in view of Wentzlaff discloses the claimed invention, “except for the feature of detecting whether there is a substantial increase in the temperature variation rate with respect to the temperature variation rate of initiating the drying procedure.” *e* *Office Action* at p. 6. Thus, it stands to reason that Kruger and Wentzlaff also do not disclose, “calculating a remaining drying time after the substantial increased is detected; and performing the drying procedure for the calculated remaining drying time, wherein the drying procedure is divided by the difference of the temperature variation rate as the drying procedure proceeds.” Further to overcome these deficiencies, the Office asserts that it would be obvious to combine Kruger and Wentzlaff with the detecting step disclosed in Gestblom to arrive at the claimed invention. *See Office Action* at p. 6. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Gestblom does not cure the deficiencies of Kruger and Wentzlaff. Gestblom discloses that there are 3 time periods of drying from initiating the drying procedure. *See* Fig. 3. However, Gestblom does not teach or suggest, “detecting whether there is a substantial increase in the temperature variation rate with respect to the temperature variation rate of initiating the drying procedure.” According to Gestblom, the drying process is finished when the temperature has risen by the predetermined amount T2 above the stored temperature T’. *See* col. 4; lines 30-34. In other words, Gestblom only discloses the predetermined temperature at which the drying procedure is finished. Thus, Gestblom does not teach or suggest, “detecting whether there is a substantial increase in the temperature variation rate with respect to the temperature variation rate of initiating the drying procedure; calculating a remaining drying time after the substantial increased is detected; and performing the drying procedure for the calculated remaining drying time, wherein the drying procedure is divided by the difference of the temperature variation rate as the drying procedure proceeds,” as claimed.

For at least these reasons, independent claim 1 and claims 16 and 18-21, which depend therefrom, are not *prima facie* obvious and are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1, 16, and 18-21.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant believes the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 3, 2010

By Alyssa K. Sandrowitz  
Alyssa K. Sandrowitz  
Registration No. 65,401  
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant